



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/986,733	11/09/2001	Narendran Ramakrishnan	01640279AA	5865

7590

03/01/2005

LAW OFFICES
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD, SUITE 340
P.O. Box 9204
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/986,733

Applicant(s)

RAMAKRISHNAN, NARENDRAN

Examiner

Hanh B Thai

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed February 9, 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Due to newly found prior art, prosecution is reopened. The allowability subject matter is withdrawn. Therefore, this action is made non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 3-6 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robison (US 5,805,894).

Regarding claim 3, Robison discloses a systematic modeling methodology for information personalization in an information system which automatically adjusts information content, structure, and presentation to an individual user comprising the steps of:

- modeling information-seeking interaction sequences with the information system wherein each interaction sequence denotes a possible dialog between the user and the information system (Fig.1A-B; Fig.2A-B of Robison showing information-seeking interaction sequence program);
- programmatically representing the interaction sequences in a computer program, wherein the interaction sequences can be initiated by the user out-of-run (col.3, lines 25-56);
- creating a personalization system by partial evaluation of the computer program to produce a simplified program (col.8, line 54-col.9, line18); and

Art Unit: 2161

- generating a personalized information space for the user in a user interface from the simplified program (col. 4, lines 32-62; Fig.1B and Fig.2B of Robison showing the representation of vector space corresponding to information space from the simplified program), wherein the generating step includes the step of: defining a program variable for each structure aspect, called structure variables (“lvalue” and “rvalue” correspond to structure variables); defining a program variable for each terminal aspect, called terminal variables; organizing the set of interaction sequences in terms of conditional elements on structural variables, using constructs provided in a programming language; declaring all structural variables to be parameters in the program; and if an interaction sequence produces values for terminal aspects, assigning values for respective terminal variables in corresponding programmatic representation (“lvalue” and “rvalue” is assigned value for terminal variables).

Regarding claim 4, Robison further discloses the step of compacting interaction sequences to determine a new set of interaction sequences having fewer states prior to the step of programmatically representing the interaction sequences in a computer program (col.8, line 54-col.9, line 18).

Regarding claim 5, Robison further discloses the step of creating a personalization system by partial evaluation of the computer program uses a source-to-source transformation engine that simplifies the computer program for static values of some program variables (col.9, lines 19-61).

Regarding claim 6, Robison further discloses the step of generating a personalized information space for the user in a user interface is performed by mapping from the simplified program to the information space, in terms of a technology corresponding to the information system (col.4, lines 25-31).

Regarding claim 11, Schidt-Joos further discloses the step of partially evaluating the program with respect to values for structural program variables (col. 4, lines 32-62; Fig.1B and Fig.2B "lvalue" and "rvalue" correspond to structure variables).

Regarding claim 12, Schidt-Joos further discloses the step of representing the information-seeking aspects as values for structural program variables; performing a partial evaluation with respect to the structural program variables (col.8, line 54-col.9, line 18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robison (US 5,805,894) in view of Schidt-Joos (US Pub. 2003/0090723 A1) of record.

Regarding claim 7, Robison discloses all of the claimed limitation as discussed above, except whereas the information-seeking interaction of the user is by means of a browser. Schidt-Joos discloses an intelligent document format for producing and processing a program document including a browser [0009]; [0013]; and [0016], Schidt-Joos). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Robison to include the claimed

Art Unit: 2161

feature as taught by Robison. The motivation of doing so would have been to efficiently reduce a simpler task for the end user ([0010], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 8, Robison/Schidt-Joos combination further discloses that the user interface is a browser window displaying an information space and a partial input specification window for facilitating user interaction (see [0016], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 9, Robison/Schidt-Joos combination further discloses that the browser supports a browsing hierarchy, said step of modeling being performed using a nested programmatic model (see [0016] and [0028], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 10, Robison/Schidt-Joos combination further discloses that the user interface comprises two windows, a first window allowing the user to proceed with an interaction along lines initiated by the information system and a second window allowing the user to take an initiative and personalize the interaction by specifying some aspect out-of-turn (see [0016], Schidt-Joos: The “server” and “client” computers are connected to network via internet, the “server” can be a “client” in a peer-to-peer network. This server can be visible to the user and accessible for direct interaction. Therefore, a “server” and “client” computer corresponds to the first window and second window).

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-4029. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2161

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh B Thai
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

February 21, 2005


JYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER